

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOSEPH M. AMOOP, *also known as Anoop Michael Joseph*,

Petitioner,

v.

MARK GARMAN, *et al.*,

Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION

No. 19-1638-KSM

ORDER

AND NOW this 30th day of September 2024, upon consideration of Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Final Judgment Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(B)(6) (Doc. No. 30), Respondents' opposition brief (Doc. No. 33), and Petitioner's reply brief (Doc. No. 39), it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The motion is **DENIED**.
2. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Karen Spencer Marston

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.

¹ Jurists of reason would not find it debatable whether the Court is correct in its procedural ruling. *See Bracey v. Superintendent Rockview SCI*, 986 F.3d 274, 282 (3d Cir. 2021) (confirming that a certificate of appealability "is required when a petitioner appeals the denial of a Rule 60(b) motion seeking reconsideration of a dismissal of a habeas petition, even if that dismissal was on procedural grounds" and that to receive such a certificate, the petitioner must make a "credible showing that the District Court's denial of his Rule 60(b) motion was erroneous"); *United States v. Ailsworth*, 631 F. App'x 626, 627 (10th Cir. 2015) (finding denial of Rule 60(b)(6) motion for lack of jurisdiction "rested on procedural grounds").